

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Magnetic fabric in carbonatic rocks from thrust shear zones: A study from the Northern Apennines (Italy)

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1766134> since 2021-01-08T16:57:12Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.tecto.2020.228573

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Magnetic Fabric in Thrust Shear Zones: A Study from the Northern Apennines (Italy)

Sara Satolli ^{a,b,*}, Claudio Robustelli Test ^{b,c}, Dorota Staneczek ^d, Elena Zanella ^{b,c}, Fernando Calamita ^a, Evdokia Tema ^{b,c}

^a Dipartimento di Ingegneria e Geologia, Università degli Studi “G. d’Annunzio” di Chieti-Pescara, via dei Vestini 31, 66100 Chieti, Italy

^b CIMaN-ALP, Centro Interuniversitario di Magnetismo Naturale - Alpine Laboratory of Paleomagnetism, via Luigi Massa 4, 12016 Peveragno, Italy

^c Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università degli Studi di Torino, via Valperga Caluso 35, 10125 Torino, Italy


^d Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Księcia Janusza 64, 01-452, Warszawa, Poland

* Corresponding author at: Dipartimento di Ingegneria e Geologia, Università degli Studi “G. d’Annunzio” di Chieti-Pescara, via dei Vestini 31, 66100 Chieti, Italy, Tel.: 0039 0871 355 6427, e-mail address: sara.satolli@unich.it

ABSTRACT

We present the results of an integrated structural and anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility (AMS) investigation in thrust shear zones. A total of 17 sites from six localities along the frontal and oblique ramp of the Olevano-Antrodoco-Sibillini thrust and back thrust (Northern Apennines, Italy) were studied to investigate both magnetic fabric and structural characteristics of Cretaceous to Neogene calcareous and marly rocks. In most of the sites AMS is controlled by the paramagnetic minerals (prevailing phyllosilicates). Structural analysis shows the presence of SC- and S-tectonites associated to predominant simple and pure shear, respectively. The combination of density diagrams and cluster analysis allowed discriminating different sedimentary/tectonic overprints on a blended magnetic fabric. Six different subfabrics were distinguished, related to the structural data and associated to deformation stages and regimes. The magnetic foliation has a double tendency to parallelize to pressure solution cleavage (S) and shear planes (C). The magnetic lineation tends to progressively align with the slip vector, save for pure-shear-dominated sites at less than 15-20 cm from the thrust, where it aligns with the transport direction. The magnetic fabric is dominated by simple shear deformation. The protocol applied for AMS analysis shows a great potential to unravel blended sedimentary and/or tectonic features in magnetic fabrics. AMS can be considered as a useful tool in unravelling the variation of simple-pure shear deformation regime in shear zones.

Keywords: Magnetic fabric; Structural geology; Pure shear; Simple shear; Tectonites



Highlights

- we performed a magnetic fabric investigation on simple-to-pure-regime shear zones
- density diagrams and cluster analysis allowed distinguishing different processes
- six different fabrics were recognized depending on the intensity of deformation
- the magnetic fabric is more sensitive to the simple shear deformation

Magnetic Fabric in Thrust Shear Zones: A Study from the Northern Apennines (Italy)

Sara Satolli ^{a,b,*}, Claudio Robustelli Test ^{b,c}, Dorota Staneczek ^d, Elena Zanella ^{b,c}, Fernando Calamita ^a, Evdokia Tema ^{b,c}

^a Dipartimento di Ingegneria e Geologia, Università degli Studi “G. d’Annunzio” di Chieti-Pescara, via dei Vestini 31, 66100 Chieti, Italy

^b CIMaN-ALP, Centro Interuniversitario di Magnetismo Naturale - Alpine Laboratory of Paleomagnetism, via Luigi Massa 4, 12016 Peveragno, Italy

^c Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università degli Studi di Torino, via Valperga Caluso 35, 10125 Torino, Italy

^d Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Księcia Janusza 64, 01-452, Warszawa, Poland

* Corresponding author at: Dipartimento di Ingegneria e Geologia, Università degli Studi “G. d’Annunzio” di Chieti-Pescara, via dei Vestini 31, 66100 Chieti, Italy, Tel.: 0039 0871 355 6427, e-mail address: sara.satolli@unich.it

ABSTRACT

We present the results of an integrated structural and anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility (AMS) investigation in thrust shear zones. A total of 17 sites from six localities along the frontal and oblique ramp of the Olevano-Antrodoco-Sibillini thrust and back thrust (Northern Apennines, Italy) were studied to investigate both magnetic fabric and structural characteristics of Cretaceous to Neogene calcareous and marly rocks. In most of the sites AMS is controlled by the paramagnetic minerals (prevailinglly phyllosilicates). Structural analysis shows the presence of SC- and S-tectonites associated to predominant simple and pure shear, respectively. The combination of density diagrams and cluster analysis allowed discriminating different sedimentary/tectonic overprints on a blended magnetic fabric. Six different subfabrics were distinguished, related to the structural data and associated to deformation stages and regimes. The magnetic foliation has a double tendency to parallelize to pressure solution cleavage (S) and shear planes (C). The magnetic lineation tends to progressively align with the slip vector, save for pure-shear-dominated sites at less than 15-20 cm from the thrust, where it aligns with the transport direction. The magnetic fabric is dominated by simple shear deformation. The protocol applied for AMS analysis shows a great potential to unravel blended sedimentary and/or tectonic features in magnetic fabrics. AMS can be considered as a useful tool in unravelling the variation of simple-pure shear deformation regime in shear zones.

Keywords: Magnetic fabric; Structural geology; Pure shear; Simple shear; Tectonites

1. Introduction

Shear zones are zones of localized high deformation that can develop in any tectonic regime, involving simple shear or a combination of simple and pure shear (Ramsay and Graham, 1970; Ramsay, 1980; Ramsay and Huber, 1987). Tectonites in simple shear regime are characterized by the association of two planar structures (Ramsay and Graham, 1970; Berthé et al., 1979; Lister and Snoke, 1984): C shear planes due to localized shear strain, being parallel to the main fault, and S pressure-solution cleavage due to the accumulation of finite strain (Jégouzo, 1980; Ponce de Leon and Choukroune, 1980). Surfaces S and C initially form with a 45° angle (SC tectonites) that can gradually decrease to 0° with progressive shear. At the last stage of deformation, the S and C planes become sub-parallel (S tectonite). For example, S-fabric characterizes oblique thrust ramps related to the transpressive reactivation of the pre-existing normal faults (Pace et al., 2015).

Other structures associated to tectonites are calcite tension veins orthogonal to S that are shortened and stretched as the deformation and density of surfaces increase (Ramsay, 1980); calcite shear veins on C, synthetic (R) and subordinated antithetic (R') shear planes, respectively at ca. 15° and 75° with respect to C (Riedel, 1929). This geometry may be more complex in sub-simple shear zones due to the presence of composed fabrics, as in the case of flanking structures or folded fabrics (e.g., Passchier, 2001, Calamita et al., 2012, Pace et al., 2015). Both synthetic and antithetic extensional shear surfaces can be observed associated with the thrust or displacing it at different stages of the deformation (e.g., Platt and Vissers, 1980; Platt, 1984; Harris and Cobbold, 1985; Holdsworth et al., 2006). Moreover, conjugate extensional shear planes develop along oblique thrust ramps associated with a significant component of pure shear (Calamita et al., 2012; Pace et al., 2015).

Shear zones can occur at very different scales, but many of their aspects are scale independent,

always showing the same characteristics (Fossen and Cavalcante, 2017). However, in an ideal shear zone the strain is maximum in its central part and a progressive rotation occurs from the margin to the central part (Fossen, 2010).

The aim of this study is to investigate how structural deformation differences in shear zones are documented by the anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility (AMS). In fact, AMS can detect the preferred orientation of para- and ferromagnetic minerals in rocks, even when the micro- or macroscopic strain markers are missing. The principal magnetic susceptibility axes are related to the tectonic stress and structural features, offering important information on the sedimentary and/or tectonic setting of a studied area. The magnetic fabric of deformed rocks has been widely investigated to quantify the progressive ductile deformation, both experimentally and theoretically (e.g., Graham, 1966; Hrouda and Jezék, 1999; Borradaile and Henry, 1997; Borradaile and Hamilton, 2004; Weil and Yonkee, 2009; Parés, 2015; Almqvist and Koyi, 2018; Hrouda and Chadima, 2019). In undeformed sedimentary rocks, AMS is defined by a magnetic foliation parallel to the bedding. The minimum susceptibility axes (k_3) are vertical, while the maximum susceptibility (k_1) axes are scattered in the horizontal plane. With layer-parallel shortening, a tectonic foliation develops and evolves with the increasing of deformation: first, the k_1 axes become subhorizontal and perpendicular to the shortening direction, then k_3 axes form a girdle parallel to the shortening direction, and finally k_3 axes group subhorizontally and parallel to the shortening direction (Weil and Yonkee, 2009 and references therein). The deformation of magnetic minerals in a ductile shear zone may be ascribed to different deforming mechanisms such as grain rotation, recrystallization and plastic deformation (Sidman et al., 2005; Ferré et al., 2014). Furthermore, the deformation mechanisms primarily depend on differential stress, tectonic regimes and on the mineralogical source of the AMS (e.g., Borradaile and Alford, 1988; Housen et al., 1995; Parés and van der Pluijm, 2002).

We present here the results of a detailed AMS fabric investigation applied on shear zones from 3 sectors of the Northern Apennines fold-and-thrust belt. These sectors are characterized by different combinations of simple and pure shear, which has been quantified through the vorticity number W_k (Xypolias, 2010; Calamita et al., 2012; Pace et al., 2015).

2. Geological Setting

The Triassic to Miocene sedimentary successions of the Northern Apennines were deposited on the Adria paleomargin (Ciarapica and Passeri, 2002) and involved in the orogenesis during the Neogene–Quaternary due to the convergence between Africa and Europe (e.g., Boccaletti et al., 2005).

The study area is located in Pliocene outer thrust of the Northern Apennines, known as the Olevano-Antrodoco-Sibillini (OAS) thrust (Fig. 1). The outer thrust shows a curved shape defined by frontal NW-SE-trending and oblique NNE-SSW-trending thrust ramps to the north and to the south of its apical zone, respectively. To the north, the OAS juxtaposes the Jurassic–Cretaceous carbonate platform and pelagic sequence on the Oligocene-Miocene hemipelagic marly succession (Scaglia Cinerea, Marne con Cerroghna and Laga Fms.) belonging to the Umbria-Marche domain. To the south the footwall is represented, instead, by a persistent carbonate platform domain (Lazio-Abruzzi domain).

The Jurassic-Eocene sequence was deposited on the Adria paleomargin during the opening of the Tethys ocean. Starting from the middle–late Miocene, the deformation switched from extension to compression in a context of positive inversion tectonics, where pre-thrusting normal faults were reactivated with different geometries (e.g., Tavarnelli et al., 2004; Butler et al., 2006; Calamita et al., 2012). The southern NNE-SSW trending sector of the OAS




Figure 1: Schematic geological map of the Northern Apennines (Italy) with the studied localities (white stars), modified after Calamita et al. (2012). The curve-shaped Olevano-Antrodoco-Sibillini (OAS) thrust is the outer front of the Northern Apennines.

reactivated the Lower Jurassic normal fault that separated the carbonate platform from the pelagic domains (Ancona-Anzio fault, Castellarin et al., 1982); after its emplacement, it was antiformally folded by anticlines developed in its footwall (Alberti et al., 1996).

During the Quaternary, post-orogenic extension, characterized by hinterland-dipping NW–SE-trending normal faults with associated intermontane basins and seismicity, affected the axial zone of Northern Apennines belt (Calamita et al., 2000; Di Domenica et al., 2012).

In the Northern Apennines, tectonites have been largely documented (Koopman, 1983; Lavecchia, 1985; Calamita et al., 1987; Ghisetti, 1987; Calamita, 1991; Calamita et al., 1991, 2012; Alberti et al., 1996; Pierantoni, 1996; Tavarnelli, 1997, 1999). They are usually associated with the outer thrust, showing different characteristics along two differently oriented thrust ramps (Calamita et al., 2012). The NNE-SSW-trending oblique thrust ramp is characterized by the presence of S tectonites, while the NW-SE-trending frontal ramp is characterized by the presence of SC tectonites. The combination of simple and pure shear, thus the degree of non-coaxiality of these shear zones has been quantified through the kinematic vorticity number, allowing to discriminate simple-shear- and pure-shear-dominate deformation (Xypolias, 2010; Calamita et al., 2012).

The lithologies most commonly affected by tectonites are Scaglia Rossa, Scaglia Cinerea and Marne con Cerroghna. The Scaglia Rossa Fm. (Lower Turonian-middle Eocene) predominantly consists in pink and red limestones and marly limestones with chert bands and nodules, and average 20 cm bed thickness. It can be divided in 4 members: i. red/pinkish limestones with dark/red chert; ii. pinkish/reddish limestones without chert; iii. marly limestones without chert; iv. red marly limestones with cherts. The Cretaceous/Paleogene boundary is between facies (ii) and (iii) that are also grouped in the same member in some geological maps. The non-carbonatic component is represented by quartz, mica-illite, montmorillonite, hematite,

magnetite and occasionally pyrite (Arthur and Fisher, 1977; ISPRA, 2007). After the Scaglia Rossa Fm., there is a transition from pelagic to turbidite sedimentation with an increase of the marly component. The Scaglia Cinerea Fm. (Upper Eocene- Lower Miocene) is represented by greyish/greenish marly limestones and marls with thin bedding. It can be divided in 3 facies: i. grey/reddish limestones; ii. greyish/greenish marls; iii. greyish marls and clay. The Marne con Cerroghna (Burdigalian-middle Tortonian) consists of medium to thickly bedded alternating marls, calcareous marls and clay marls, intercalated with calcareous turbidites (Centamore and Micarelli, 1991).

3. Methods

We sampled tectonites from different sectors of the Northern Apennines (Fig. 1) in order to characterize their magnetic fabric at several localities on the frontal (Sassotetto, Monastero, Infernaccio) and oblique (Boragine, Vallescura) ramps of OAS, and on a back thrust from the inner sector of the Northern Apennines (Cottanello) .

3.1 Structural analysis

Structural data were collected to analyze the local trends of the main structures and the slip vector was calculated on the stereonet after measuring S and C surfaces.

Three localities, Sassotetto (43°01'09.0"N, 13°14'54.2"E), Monastero (43°03'30.6"N, 13°13'53.0"E) and Infernaccio (42°55'24.5"N, 13°16'50.0"E), were selected in the frontal NW-SE-trending OAS thrust. This sector is characterized by a well-developed brittle–ductile shear zone, with SC tectonites of decametric thickness, mostly involving the micritic pelagic limestones of the Scaglia Rossa Fm. and the marly lithologies of the Scaglia Cinerea Fm. in a simple shear dominated deformation regime characterized by a vorticity number close to 1 (W_k

= 0.96 - 0.99; Calamita et al., 2012).

Two localities, Boragine (42°29'30.7"N, 13°03'05.5"E) and Vallescura (42°34'47.6"N, 13°08'21.1"E) are located in the NNE-SSW-trending OAS thrust, that emplaces the pelagic carbonates of Scaglia Rossa Fm. onto the marls and shales of the Marne con Cerroghna Fm.. Here, the shear zone is characterized by S tectonites developed in a pure shear-dominated regime with a W_k varying between 0.27 and 0.76 (Calamita et al., 2012; Pace et al., 2015).

Finally, one locality, Cottanello (42°25'00.9"N, 12°41'25.1"E) was selected in the inner sector of the Apennines, ca. 40 km west of the NNE-SSW-trending OAS oblique thrust ramp, in proximity of a N10 trending structure known in the literature as the Sabina Fault. This feature shows complex kinematics with slip vectors in three different directions: NE-SW, NNE-SSW and E-W (Pierantoni, 1996). In the literature, it was interpreted as a dextral strike-slip (Alfonsi et al., 1995) or transpressive fault characterized by kinematics partitioning (Pierantoni, 1996), or as an east-dipping high-angle back-thrust reactivating pre-existing normal faults bounding a symmetric Jurassic basin (Scisciani, 2009; Calamita et al., 2011; Di Domenica et al., 2012; Pace and Calamita, 2014).

3.2 Anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility

3.2.1 Sampling

From each locality, 1 to 5 sites were sampled and studied. Both site size and sampling strategy were decided based on the homogeneity and pervasivity of the tectonic structures as well as on the outcrop conditions. However, in order to obtain significant statistical analysis, at least 10 oriented hand samples of 10-20 cm lithons were collected at each site. Sites were named accordingly to the locality (first letter: S = Sassotetto; I = Infernaccio; M = Monastero; B = Boragine; V = Vallescura; C = Cottanello), the lithology (second and third letters: SR = Scaglia

189 Rossa Fm.; SC = Scaglia Cinerea Fm.; MC = Marne con Cerroghna Fm.) and the distance from
190 the fault plane (progressive numbers with the distance increment) or sublocality.

191 Along the frontal thrust ramp, the hanging wall was sampled at Sassotetto at ca. 15-20 m from
192 the main thrust, while the footwall was sampled at Monastero at ca. 15 m (MSC1) and ca. 45
193 m (MSC2), and at Infernaccio at ca. 30 m below the main thrust.

194 From the oblique thrust ramp at Boragine and Vallescura, we sampled different levels at a
195 progressively increasing distance of 15-20 cm from the main thrust. In both localities, 2 sites
196 in the hanging wall into the Scaglia Rossa Fm. and 3 sites in the footwall into the Marne con
197 Cerroghna Fm. were sampled.

198 Finally, at Cottanello we sampled 3 different 1-m-wide levels located at progressively
199 increasing distance from the main fault.

200 All collected blocks were oriented *in situ* with a compass and an inclinometer. From each block
201 several specimens were prepared at the laboratory, weighed and centered into plastic boxes (2
202 cm x 2 cm x 2 cm) where they were fixed with non magnetic plasticine. A total of 327 oriented
203 specimens was obtained from 17 sites.

204 3.2.2 Laboratory Analysis and data processing

205 For each specimen, the AMS was measured with an AGICO KLY-3 Kappabridge (sensitivity
206 of 2×10^{-8} SI), at the CIMaN-ALP (Centro Interuniversitario di Magnetismo Naturale - Alpine
207 Laboratory of Paleomagnetism, Peveragno, Italy). Measurements were conducted using the
208 manual mode (15 different directions) at the instrument's operating frequency of 875 Hz and
209 field intensity of 300 Am^{-1} . In order to maximize the holder correction, critical in the case of
210 samples with very low susceptibility values, we executed it on the holder, plastic box and
211 plasticine ensemble. Then, the mass magnetic susceptibility (χ_m) was computed for each

specimen.

All measurements were subjected to a quality check. Only measurements with all three F-statistics of the anisotropy tests (F , F_{12} and F_{23}) higher than 5 were accepted as reliable. $F > 3.4817$ indicates a statistically anisotropic specimen within the 95% of likelihood, and F_{12} , $F_{23} > 4.2565$ allow to reject the null-hypothesis of rotational symmetry (Hrouda, 2002 and references therein). In addition, few outliers characterized by $\pm 2\sigma$ difference with respect to the mean of AMS scalar parameters were excluded from further analysis.

On the retained specimens, the magnetic fabric was reconstructed at site level by computing the AMS second rank tensor using the software ANISOFT (Chadima and Jelínek, 2008), based on Jelínek statistics (Jelínek, 1977). The anisotropy tensor is represented as a tri-axial ellipsoid ($k_1 \geq k_2 \geq k_3$), whose axes orientation and magnitude depends on the relative abundance of mineral species and their grain orientations. Particularly, the k_3 axis represents the pole of the magnetic foliation plane and the k_1 direction defines the magnetic lineation. The AMS ellipsoid shape is defined by the scalar parameter T and can vary from oblate ($0 \leq T \leq +1$) to prolate ($-1 \leq T \leq 0$) (Jelínek, 1981). The intensity of the preferred orientation of magnetic minerals, which results in the eccentricity of the AMS ellipsoid, is represented by the parameter P' (Jelínek, 1981), called the corrected degree of anisotropy. A progressive tectonic deformation and a partial fabric overprinting due to different mineralogy behavior may result in a blended magnetic fabric (Borradaile and Jackson, 2004).

In order to define the presence of different subfabrics at site level, we first removed outliers characterized by significant variations of χ_m , P' and/or T parameters, and we then identified clusters of AMS scalar parameters. When clusters were not defined by these parameters and blended fabrics were clearly displayed, we applied a combination of contouring and cluster analysis on each principal axis to identify different subfabrics (Borradaile and Jackson, 2004;

236 Borradaile and Jackson, 2010; Aubourg et al., 2010; Caricchi et al., 2016; Robustelli Test et
237 al., 2019). Subfabrics were detected computing the cluster analysis with the Stereo32 software
238 (Röller and Trepmann, 2008) and were validated using P' , T and χ_m variations. In this way, we
239 distinguished groups of specimens affected by different sedimentary or tectonic processes.

240

241 **4. Results**

242 **4.1 Structural data**


243 *4.1.1 Shear zones along frontal thrust ramps*

244 The SC tectonites show centimeter-to-decameter spaced C shear planes with calcite-bearing
245 shear veins sub-parallel to the main thrust and centimeter-spaced S pressure solution cleavage,
246 identifying spaced and elongated sigmoidal-shaped calcareous lithons. Millimeter- to
247 centimeter-scale tension veins filled with calcite are perpendicular to the S foliation and low-
248 angle synthetic R planes are also present.

249 Sassotetto and Monastero are located at the hanging wall and footwall of the same thrust shear
250 zone, respectively. Sassotetto was sampled in the Scaglia Rossa Fm. and shows C planes
251 oriented at 250/24 and S fabric oriented at 231/57. Monastero is located in the footwall of the
252 same thrust zone in the Scaglia Cinerea Fm. and shows C planes oriented at 232/27 and S
253 planes oriented at 242/54. Infernaccio is also located in the footwall of the thrust shear zone
254 juxtaposing the Scaglia Rossa on the Scaglia Cinerea Fm. Here, the kinematic analysis shows
255 C planes oriented at 230/20 and S planes oriented at 254/61 (Calamita et al., 2012) while
256 synthetic R planes are oriented at 248/09.

257 In this sector, the SC intersection is NW-SE with a slip vector indicating a NE displacement

258 direction (Fig. 2).



259

260 **Figure 2:** Summary of the structural data for each studied locality integrated with data from
261 the literature (Calamita et al., 2012; Turtù et al., 2013; Pace et al., 2015).

4.1.2 Shear zones along oblique thrust ramps

The S surfaces are sub-parallel to the main thrust plane, identifying marly–calcareous lens-shaped lithons. The foliation is more pervasive in the marls and shales lithotypes of the Marne con Cerroghna, and is decimeter-spaced in the marly/calcareous Scaglia Rossa Fm.. Furthermore, synthetic and antithetic extensional structures displace the main thrust surface and the associated shear zone.

At Boragine the thrust plane (T) is oriented 334/29 and the S surfaces are oriented 303/22, with a NW-SE-trending S/T intersection. Synthetic and antithetic plane E and E' are oriented 057/37 and 274/42, respectively (Calamita et al., 2012; Turtù et al., 2013). At Vallescura the thrust plane is oriented 302/30 and the S surfaces are oriented 250/29. Synthetic and antithetic planes E and E' are oriented 394/44 and 243/57, respectively (Calamita et al., 2012).

In both localities, the N60-70 transport direction (Calamita et al., 2012) differs from the S-SSW computed slip vector (Fig. 2).

4.1.3 Back-thrust in a transpressive context

Cottanello is characterized by sub-simple shear with $W_k = 0.72$ (Pace et al., 2015). Here, SC tectonites are well developed in the Scaglia Rossa Fm. and exposed in a quarry of the Roman period (San Pietro quarry). The tectonites are characterized by centimeter-spaced C planes oriented 244/75 and millimeter- to centimeter-spaced S surfaces oriented 025/52. Frequent low-angle R synthetic planes cross the shear zone at ca. 20° to the C-surfaces (Pace et al., 2015). The slip vector is toward S-SSW, while slickensides indicate a NE-E direction (Fig. 2).

4.2 AMS results

All the sampled lithologies show consistent P' and T parameters (Table 1; Fig. 3B-C). Their magnetic ellipsoids are mainly neutral to slightly oblate with mean $T = 0.136 \pm 0.307$. Overall, P' is moderate with mean values of $P' = 1.058 \pm 0.053$. Mass-susceptibility is generally low (mean value $\chi_m = 11.8 \pm 12.27 [x 10^{-9} m^3 kg^{-1}]$) but varies depending on the lithology (Fig. 3A): $\chi_m = 28.80 \pm 15.11 [x 10^{-9} m^3 kg^{-1}]$ in the Scaglia Cinerea Fm.; $\chi_m = 8.22 \pm 5.61 [x 10^{-9} m^3 kg^{-1}]$ in the Marne con Cerroghna Fm., and $\chi_m = 5.77 \pm 5.16 [x 10^{-9} m^3 kg^{-1}]$ in the Scaglia Rossa Fm.. The complete list of specimens and their parameters is reported in Supplementary Table 1 and 2 for the specimens and at site level, respectively.

Those values indicate that the magnetic fabric is dominated by the contribution of paramagnetic minerals such as clay minerals (Tarling and Hrouda, 1993), save for two sites from the Scaglia Rossa Fm. located at Boragine. In these cases, diamagnetic minerals are the main carrier of the magnetic fabric, probably also due to the high pervasivity of calcite veins. Significant low values of magnetic susceptibility in the Scaglia Rossa Fm. were also reported in previous studies (Mattei et al., 1995). The occurrence of diamagnetic phases might reveal the presence of inverse fabric in those sites.

4.2.1 AMS from the frontal thrust ramps

All sites show a well-defined magnetic fabric with clustered k_3 and slightly dispersed k_1 and k_2 axes. The magnetic foliation is mostly WSW-dipping at medium to high angle, save for site MSC2 (see Fig. 5), which shows a S-dipping sub-horizontal magnetic foliation. The shape of the ellipsoid is mainly oblate with T values up to 0.902. The degree of anisotropy P' is moderate, ranging from 1.015 to 1.147. Variations of P' occur in relation to the different sampled lithologies and distances from the main thrust (Fig. 3B and Fig. 4A-C).

Locality	Site	Stage	n/N	$\chi_m (\pm \sigma)$ ($\times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1}$)	P'	T	k ₁				k ₃			
							D	I	95% conf. angles		D	I	95% conf. angles	
Sassotetto	SSR1		16/20	11.16 \pm 5.19	1,040	0,785	295	32	52,1	18,3	47	31	21,1	11,6
	SSR1-SF1	E	10/16	12.71 \pm 5.76	1,030	0,671	191	50	56,7	22,9	40	36	26,8	12,9
	SSR1-SF2	C	6/16	8.56 \pm 2.86	1,061	0,386	304	29	18,6	8,8	51	28	13,3	8,6
Monastero	MSC1		19/20	39.65 \pm 21.54	1,021	0,613	342	5	35,1	13,5	76	39	18,6	12,1
	MSC1-SF1	C	8/19	17.20 \pm 4.45	1,021	0,903	161	2,3	77,5	12,0	70	32	14,4	8,9
	MSC1-SF2	C	11/19	55.98 \pm 11.19	1,023	0,465	346	6	19,2	13,2	82	45	20,2	10,7
	MSC2		19/19	24.69 \pm 2.66	1,017	0,648	133	13	59,4	13,0	1	71	22,2	13,8
	MSC2-SF1	A	10/19	24.12 \pm 1.91	1,019	0,158	100	1	31,8	12,9	8	77	17,0	11,4
	MSC2-SF2	B	9/19	25.32 \pm 3.39	1,020	0,052	169	22	28,5	14,2	351	68	32,5	14,2
	ISC1		19/21	22.07 \pm 7.02	1,032	0,856	212	50	75,1	24,4	76	32	30,1	24,6
Infernaccio	ISC1-SF1	D	14/19	18.63 \pm 2.86	1,014	0,479	183	35	53,3	21,6	68	31	33,8	14,9
	ISC1-SF2	E	5/19	31.71 \pm 6.10	1,117	0,657	297	59	17,9	7,7	79	25	18,7	7,6
Monte Boragine	BSR2	F*	10/15	-2.03 \pm 0.98	1,076	-0,351	319	59	68,7	18,1	180	25	31,9	16,0
	BSR1	F*	10/19	-3.33 \pm 1.81	1,027	-0,656	169	80	70,0	31,0	9	10	43,3	23,9
	BMC1	E''	8/12	2.52 \pm 1.94	1,055	0,147	250	46	59,9	27,9	4	21	52,9	20,8
	BMC2		13/16	9.83 \pm 6.33	1,032	0,593	243	13	43,6	17,3	128	61	25,7	17,3
	BMC2-SF1	E or E''	6/13	6.44 \pm 2.28	1,027	0,175	35	6	37,0	23,4	134	57	31,3	14,7
	BMC2-SF2	D''	7/13	12.74 \pm 7.37	1,040	0,410	266	23	30,8	18,2	121	63	22,4	14,2
	BMC3		15/21	1.05 \pm 2.96	1,121	-0,037	201	21	44,2	24,5	9	69	59,4	23,6
	BMC3-SF1	E or E''	8/15	3.34 \pm 1.96	1,035	-0,225	211	1	49,7	20,5	304	72	45,3	28,5
	BMC3-SF2	D*	7/15	-1.56 \pm 1.00	1,080	0,071	197	29	34,2	19,9	29	61	54,6	15,2
	VSR2		19/21	7.23 \pm 1.88	1,022	0,010	207	25	32,2	17,8	31	65	35,3	16,6
	VSR2-SF1	E''	14/19	7.12 \pm 1.80	1,027	-0,383	211	25	23,3	16,7	28	65	43,5	15,2
	VSR2-SF2	F	5/19	7.52 \pm 2.29	1,020	-0,134	132	4	23,0	12,1	35	59	22,7	15,6
	VSR1	E''	23/24	9.29 \pm 2.17	1,039	0,091	230	28	24,3	18,0	67	61	24,3	18,0
	VMC1		18/21	8.56 \pm 3.56	1,015	0,529	263	21	68,5	14,8	29	57	33,5	18,7
	VMC1-SF1	E''	10/18	8.16 \pm 2.22	1,020	-0,346	227	26	22,5	18,6	1	55	45,1	21,6
	VMC1-SF2	F	8/18	9.07 \pm 4.89	1,023	-0,361	303	5	28,3	9,6	38	42	46,0	10,3
	VMC2		19/21	12.25 \pm 2.37	1,024	0,406	234	21	49,0	15,8	37	68	22,7	15,8
	VMC2-SF1	D''	9/19	12.25 \pm 2.37	1,032	-0,004	253	19	11,6	10,5	43	68	28,2	8,7
	VMC2-SF2	E	10/19	12.42 \pm 1.51	1,020	0,186	191	20	25,6	14,1	28	69	26,8	14,9
	VMC3		18/21	11.56 \pm 3.62	1,022	0,442	204	22	44,0	20,6	60	64	28,3	20,1
	VMC3-SF1	D''	8/18	11.44 \pm 3.24	1,025	0,120	244	38	30,4	17,3	64	53	23,6	21,8
	VMC3-SF2	E	10/18	12.18 \pm 4.37	1,025	0,181	185	12	21,0	15,1	37	77	25,9	16,3
Cottanello	CSR1		13/15	2.97 \pm 1.21	1,025	-0,056	317	35	50,4	26,9	204	29	39,4	26,3
	CSR1-SF1	D	6/13	2.4 \pm 1.37	1,039	0,113	325	42	53,5	22,8	188	39	36,8	21,3
	CSR1-SF2	C	7/13	3.47 \pm 0.86	1,019	0,097	312	17	51,2	11,4	221	5	30,5	11,4
	CSR2		16/22	5.72 \pm 2.79	1,026	0,058	329	22	47,5	25,1	167	67	47,6	23,0
	CSR2-SF1	E	8/16	5.91 \pm 2.78	1,045	0,222	13	40	22,2	13,5	188	50	14,6	13,0
	CSR2-SF2	C	8/16	5.52 \pm 2.97	1,038	0,329	324	4	32,8	12,9	60	57	27,4	13,6
	CSR3		15/20	6.76 \pm 4.20	1,042	0,453	12	18	56,0	26,6	228	68	26,8	10,8
	CSR3-SF1	E	9/15	5.80 \pm 4.30	1,049	-0,026	20	16	36,0	26,5	240	69	26,8	14,6
	CSR3-SF2	C	6/15	8.19 \pm 3.97	1,042	0,395	308	1	37,4	8,0	217	61	20,9	4,8

Table 1: Summary of the anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility data at site level.

Columns: Locality; Site; Stage = degree of deformation from sedimentary fabric (A) to latest tectonic event (F), (*)inverse fabric and (//)tectonic fabric parallel to the transport direction; n/N = number of specimens accepted/number of specimens measured; χ_m = mean mass magnetic susceptibility ($10^{-9} \text{m}^3 \text{kg}^{-1}$) and its standard deviation; P' = corrected anisotropy degree; T = shape parameter; D = declination ($^\circ$), I = inclination ($^\circ$) and 95% confidence angle ($^\circ$) of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes k_1 and k_2 , respectively.

The SC tectonites at Sassotetto (Fig. 5) show an oblate magnetic fabric $T = 0.785 \pm 0.340$. The magnetic foliation is SW-dipping and steeply inclined. Two different subfabrics have been detected: i. subfabric 1 is characterized by a lower anisotropy degree and higher χ_m (Table 1; Fig.4A). The magnetic fabric is slightly oblate with a N-S trending magnetic lineation; ii. subfabric 2, characterized by higher P' and lower χ_m , shows an oblate fabric with a sub-horizontal NW-SE-trending k_1 axis.

Both sites from Monastero (Fig. 5) show two overlapping magnetic fabrics. Site MSC1 is characterized by a steep WSW-dipping magnetic foliation and k_1 axis N-S trending. The plot of χ_m versus P' reveals two clusters corresponding to two subfabrics with consistent magnetic foliation and lineation (Fig. 4B, Fig. 5): i. subfabric 1 (MSC1-Sf1) is characterized by lower P' and χ_m values, and a higher dispersion of k_1 and k_2 axes on the magnetic foliation plane; ii. instead, subfabric 2 (MSC1-Sf2) shows well grouped axes.




Figure 3: Box-and-whisker plots of the a) mass magnetic susceptibility (χ_m), b) corrected anisotropy degree (P') and c) shape parameter (T) for the studied localities. Central boxes include values between the lower and upper quartiles. Different gray shades correspond to different lithologies.




Figure 4: Corrected anisotropy degree (P') vs. mass susceptibility (χ_m) and shape parameter (T) vs. corrected anisotropy degree (P') plots for the various localities. Different symbols correspond to different lithologies: circles and stars for Scaglia Rossa Fm., squares for Scaglia Cinerea Fm. and lozenges and triangles for Marne con Cerrognia Fm.


Site MSC2 displays a sub-horizontal S-dipping magnetic foliation. Here, the two subfabrics (see MSC2-Sf1 and MSC2-Sf2 in Fig. 5) show consistent k_3 but different mean k_1 and k_2 axes orientations. The different axes orientation is associated with variations in shape parameter (T). Subfabric 1 is characterized by a slightly oblate ellipsoid ($T = 0.158 \pm 0.230$) and a sub-horizontal E-W trending magnetic lineation, while subfabric 2, showing a N-S trending magnetic lineation, is neutral with $T = 0.052 \pm 0.240$.

Infernaccio shows the superposition of two subfabrics (see ISC1-Sf1 and ISC1-Sf2 in Fig. 5 and Fig. 4C) that differ in terms of AMS scalar parameters and k_1 axes orientations: i. subfabric 1 displays a neutral fabric with dispersed k_1 and k_2 axes and a sub-horizontal magnetic lineation mainly N-S trending, lower P' values and high variability of shape parameter ranging from -0.481 to 0.678; ii. subfabric 2 is characterized by well grouped axes with E-W trending k_1 , and strongly oblate fabric and high anisotropy degree.

4.2.2 AMS from the oblique thrust ramp

The magnetic fabric is represented by a blended AMS fabric, with mainly neutral to slightly oblate magnetic ellipsoid ($T = 0.077 \pm 0.269$) (Table 1; Fig. 3). k_3 axes are mostly grouped, while k_1 and k_2 are dispersed on the magnetic foliation. The anisotropy degree is moderate with mean value of $P' = 1.066 \pm 0.064$. χ_m values significantly vary between localities. This in turn determines the differences in magnetic fabric configuration.

Boragine is characterized by significative changes of χ_m values between lithologies. Specimens from Scaglia Rossa Fm. (sites BSR1 and BSR2 in Fig. 6 and Fig. 4E) are mainly diamagnetic, with $\chi_m = -1.73 \pm 2.60 [x 10^{-9} \text{ m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}]$. The three sites from Marne con Cerroghna Fm. show higher values, with a maximum value of $24.35 [x 10^{-9} \text{ m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}]$. This significantly affects the configuration of the AMS fabric in this location.



362

363

364

Figure 5 (previous page): Magnetic fabric from the frontal thrust ramp at Sassotetto, Monastero (sites MSC1 and MSC2) and Infernaccio. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics (middle and right).

Sites BSR1 and BSR2, located above the main thrust, display an E-W-trending subvertical magnetic foliation with dispersed k_1 and k_2 axes (Fig. 6). Despite higher and positive χ_m values (ranging from 0.74 to 5.73 [$\times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}$] see Fig. 4E-F), site BMC1 from Marne con Cerroghna shows a similar blended fabric with a sub-vertical E-W-trending magnetic foliation. Here, specimens display k_1 axes E-W to SW-NE trending at medium angles.

The other two sites from Marne con Cerroghna Fm., BMC2 and BMC3, are characterized by a fabric with a sub-horizontal magnetic foliation. The ellipsoid shapes are slightly oblate and prolate, respectively. The site BMC2 might be characterized by the presence of two neutral subfabrics with the same orientation of the magnetic foliation. The k_1 axes form an angle of about 122° between subfabrics. Instead, at site BMC3 specimens with negative χ_m values (BMC3-Sf1 in Fig. 6) define a prolate subfabric characterized by higher P' .

All sites from Vallescura have a consistent magnetic fabric (Fig. 7). Overall, the AMS fabric shows a magnetic foliation SW-dipping at low angle with slightly dispersed k_1 and k_2 axes. The P' values are moderate ($P' = 1.040 \pm 0.017$) and the shape parameter is slightly oblate with mean values $T = 0.283 \pm 0.264$ (Fig. 4G-H).

Two different subfabrics are detected at sites level: i. subfabric 1, characterized by a magnetic foliation SW-dipping and sub-horizontal SW-NE to WSW-ENE trending magnetic lineation; ii. subfabric 2 shows a sub-horizontal magnetic foliation and NW-SE to N-S trending k_1 axes.




Figure 6 (previous page): Magnetic fabric from the oblique thrust ramp at Boragine. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics when detected (middle and right). Legend as in Figure 5.

The subfabric 1 dominates the main fabric. In fact, it strongly affects the orientation of both magnetic foliation and lineation. Furthermore, k_1 and k_3 axes show counterclockwise (CCW) and clockwise (CW) rotations when the distance from the main thrust increases, in the hanging wall and footwall respectively. Instead, subfabric 2 shows consistent configuration close to the main thrust with a NW-SE-trending magnetic lineation. In the footwall, k_1 rotates by 116° CCW passing from site VMC1 to VMC2, thus when increasing the distance from the thrust.

4.2.3 AMS from back-thrust

All sites show a magnetic fabric characterized by slightly clustered k_3 axes. The k_1 and k_2 axes are dispersed on the N to NNE-dipping magnetic foliation. The low to moderate χ_m (mean value of $5.26 \pm 3.37 [\times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}]$) and P' values are consistent among sites (Tab. 1; Fig. 4D). Shape parameters change from mainly oblate at site CSR3 to slightly prolate at sites CSR1. At the same time, the magnetic foliation shifts from sub-horizontal to sub-vertical (Fig. 8).

In addition, all sites reveal the presence of two subfabrics: i. subfabric 1 showing a slightly inclined magnetic lineation NNW to NE trending; ii. subfabric 2 characterized by a NW-SE-trending sub-horizontal magnetic lineation. Similar fabric has been previously documented in this area (Mattei et al., 1995).




Figure 7 (previous page): Magnetic fabric from the oblique thrust ramp at Vallescura. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics when detected (middle and right). Legend as in Figure 5.

A closer look reveals the dominance of Subfabric 1 on the main fabric in proximity to the main thrust (site CSR1). The subfabric 2 progressively becomes dominant on the definition of the magnetic foliation with the increment of the distance from the fault (Fig. 8). Particularly, variations in the Subfabric 1 configuration control the rotation of k_1 and k_2 axes. In fact, from site CSR3 to CSR1 the progressive verticalization of the magnetic foliation is associated with a CCW rotation of k_1 axis from $N20^\circ$ to NNW. On the contrary, in all sites the subfabric 2 shows stable NW-SE trending orientation of the magnetic lineation. In these cases, k_1 acts as a rotation pin producing a progressive switch between k_3 and k_2 axes and the verticalization of the magnetic foliation when getting closer to the main thrust.

5. Comparison with structural data

Magnetic fabric analysis revealed straightforward correlations with structural data. It was possible to infer 6 different AMS fabrics, named from A to F according to the intensity of deformation; symbols * and // indicate inverse fabric and parallelism with transport direction, respectively.

In the following, we report the comparison between AMS and structural data at site level.

At Sassotetto, subfabric 1 is represented by a magnetic foliation parallel to the pressure solution cleavage, where k_1 is close to the direction of the slip vector. This subfabric may represent an




Figure 8: Magnetic fabric from the back-thrust at Cottanello. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics (middle and right). Legend as in Figure 5.

advanced stage of deformation with k_1 parallel to the transport direction (Stage E, Fig. 9). In the same locality, subfabric 2 shows k_1 and k_3 consistent with S/C intersection and S pole, respectively. It represents the early stage of shearing with k_1 at the S/C intersection (Stage C,

441 Fig. 9).

442 At Monastero, a different magnetic fabric is documented in sites MSC1 and MSC2, sampled
443 at 15 m and 45 m from the main thrust, respectively. In site MSC1, k_1 is at the S/C intersection
444 and the magnetic foliation is parallel to the S plane. In particular, subfabric 1 reveals the
445 coincidence between k_3 and S pole, but k_1 axes are dispersed in the foliation plane parallel to
446 S. Subfabric 2, instead, reveals a better clustering of k_1 , aligned with the S/C intersection. Here,
447 the two subfabrics may represent the same process of earlier deformation stages (Stage C) with
448 a better definition of the tectonic fabric in subfabric 2 due to higher χ_m values.

449 In site MSC2, subfabric 1 shows an horizontal magnetic foliation consistent with the bedding
450 and moderate dispersion of k_1 and k_2 axis, representing the preserved sedimentary fabric of the
451 Scaglia Cinerea Fm. (Stage A, Fig. 9). In subfabric 2, k_2 and k_3 are dispersed on a girdle and
452 k_1 is at the S/C intersection. This configuration might represent the early stage of deformation
453 (Stage B), where the sedimentary fabric is partially preserved and k_1 corresponds to the
454 intersection lineation between bedding and cleavage. In fact, in incipient deformation stage the
455 magnetic foliation remains parallel to the bedding while the magnetic lineation becomes
456 perpendicular to the bedding-parallel shortening. When the deformation increases the magnetic
457 foliation poles create a girdle parallel to the shortening (Hrouda and Chadima, 2019).
458 Furthermore, principal axes of maximum susceptibility are particularly sensitive to tectonic
459 shortening, as they develop a magnetic lineation that mimics the intersection of bedding and
460 tectonic flattening plane (Parés, 2015).

461 At Infernaccio, the subfabric 1 shows the parallelism between magnetic foliation and S plane,
462 and k_1 is moving toward the slip vector direction (Stage D, Fig. 9). On the contrary, subfabric
463 2 reveals k_1 axes at high angle in respect to the S/C intersection and sub-parallel to the slip
464 vector (Stage E, Fig. 9).

465 Where the magnetic lineation is mainly defined by paramagnetic carriers, it evolves from
466 parallelism to the S/C intersection during earlier deformational stages to parallelism to the slip
467 vector in advanced stages (Parés et al., 1999; Pueyo Anchuela et al., 2010).

468 The configuration of the subfabric 1 is consistent between Sassotetto and Infernaccio, differing
469 only by 24° in the magnetic foliation orientation. Instead, the subfabric 2 shows an increment
470 in k_1 axis inclination. On the contrary, at Monastero a change in magnetic foliation dipping
471 angle is visible in both subfabrics. Particularly, subfabric 1 shows a 61° CW rotation of the
472 magnetic lineation associated with the verticalization of the magnetic foliation from site MSC1
473 to site MSC2. In both sites, the subfabric 2 shows a consistent sub-horizontal N-S trending
474 magnetic lineation. Only an increment in the magnetic foliation dipping is here visible.

475 Overall, the simple-shear-dominated deformation regime (Calamita et al., 2012) from the
476 frontal ramp shows a magnetic foliation parallel to the S or in between S and C planes and k_1
477 parallel to the S/C intersection or to the slip vector, depending on the degree of deformation
478 (from Stage C to E). Sedimentary features and early stage of cleavage development are also
479 visible at site MSC2 (45 m from the thrust).

480 A similar behaviour is documented at Cottanello, where all 3 sites show a magnetic foliation
481 with an intermediate orientation between S and C planes and k_1 axes dispersed from the S/C
482 intersection toward the slip vector (inferred from the S/C intersection). A magnetic foliation at
483 an intermediate position between S and C planes was previously described in other fault zones,
484 both under extensional and compressional regimes (Aranguren et al., 1996; Casas-Sainz et al.,
485 2017). Such relationships can be explained by both deformational and mineralogical controls
486 (Casas-Sainz et al., 2018).

487 Particularly at site CSR1, the subfabric 1 shows a magnetic foliation parallel to the S and
488 slightly dispersion of k_1 between the S/C intersection and the slip vector (Stage D in Fig.9). At

489 sites CSR2 and CSR3, it shows a magnetic foliation parallel to the C and k_1 consistent with the
490 inferred slip vector (Stage E).

491 In all sites, subfabric 2 shows a parallelism between k_1 and the S/C intersection (Stage C),
492 representing the intersection lineation, while the magnetic foliation is characterized by the same
493 strike of C plane, but variable dipping angles. In fact, at site CSR1, k_2 and k_3 are dispersed on
494 a girdle, while at site CSR3 the magnetic foliation shows an intermediate orientation between
495 S and C planes. On the contrary, site CSR2 shows a SW dipping magnetic foliation.

496 The sub-simple shear of Cottanello (Pace et al., 2015) shows a magnetic foliation intermediate
497 between S and C, k_1 parallel to the S/C intersection or the slip vector, depending on the degree
498 of deformation witnessed by groups of specimens.

499 At Vallescura and Boragine, the sampling was done across the thrust plane, both in the hanging-
500 wall and footwall block.

501 In the hanging-wall block of Vallescura, site VSR1 and subfabric 1 of VSR2 show the magnetic
502 foliation consistent with the S plane and k_1 parallel to the transport direction (Stage E'', Fig.9).
503 The subfabric 2 of site VSR2 reveals a k_1 axis coincident with the E-E' intersection (Stage F,
504 Fig. 9).

505 In the footwall block, also VMC1 magnetic fabric shows a parallelism between magnetic
506 foliation and S plane. The subfabric 1 is characterized by a fan dispersion of k_2 and k_3 and k_1
507 parallel to the transport direction (Stage E''), while subfabric 2 reveals k_1 axis parallel to the E-
508 E' intersection (Stage F). In both VMC2 e VMC3 the subfabric 1 is characterized by the
509 parallelisms between magnetic foliation and S planes, and k_1 is grouped in an intermediate
510 orientation between the S/T intersection and the transport direction (Stage D''). On the contrary,
511 in both sites subfabric 2 shows a parallelism between magnetic foliation planes and S planes.
512 k_1 axes are N-S trending and may indicate a parallelism with the inferred slip vector (Stage

513 $E^{(//)}$).

514 At Boragine most sites show low bulk magnetic susceptibility values (k_m), close to the
515 instrumental limit. This might have caused problems related to mean tensors and their
516 confidence ellipses calculation. For that reason, only site BMC2, characterized by high χ_m
517 values, is considered reliable for further interpretations. However, for the sake of completeness,
518 we reported the comparison between AMS and structural data for all sites.

519 In the hanging wall, sites BSR1 and BSR2 show highly scattered axes, with k_1 mostly
520 subvertical and dispersed on a E-W girdle. In both sites k_3 is partially grouped at the E-E'
521 intersection (Stage F*). At site BMC1, k_2 and k_3 axes are highly dispersed along a N-S girdle,
522 while k_1 axes are grouped in the transport direction (Stage $E^{(//)}$).

523 At site BMC2, the subfabric 1 shows a magnetic foliation intermediate between S and T planes
524 and k_1 has a double tendency to parallelize with the direction of the slip vector and the transport
525 direction (Stage E or $E^{(//)}$ in Fig. 9). The subfabric 2 is characterized by a magnetic foliation
526 parallel to S planes and k_1 intermediate between S/T intersection and the slip vector (Stage $D^{(//)}$,
527 Fig. 9).

528 Finally, in BMC3, subfabric 1 shows a subhorizontal magnetic foliation with interdispersed k_2
529 and k_3 axes, while k_1 are mostly grouped with double tendency in the slip vector and the
530 transport directions. Subfabric 2 shows high dispersed k_1 and k_2 axes, while k_3 is grouped at
531 high angle from N to E. The fabric is inverse and k_3 might be considered to assume an
532 orientation intermediate between the directions of the slip vector and the inferred slip vector.




Figure 9: Summary of magnetic fabric stages and comparison with structural data. Representative examples from the different deformation regimes are reported. Conceptual diagram of the different types of shear deformation fabric (ZX section of strain ellipses) related

to frontal (FTR) and oblique (OTR) thrust ramps (modified from Calamita et al., 2012; Pace et al., 2015).

In this pure-shear-dominated deformation regime (Calamita et al., 2012) the magnetic foliation is mostly parallel to S, even if some sites from Boragine show additional complexities where k_1 (or k_3 in case of possible inverse fabric) are: i. parallel to the slip vector (Stage E or E*); ii. parallel to the transport direction (Stage E''); iii. in between the S/T intersection and the slip vector (Stage D'' or D*); iv. parallel to the E-E' intersection close to the main thrust (Stage F or F*).

6. Conclusion

We investigated the magnetic anisotropy in shear zones from 3 sectors of the Northern Apennines fold-and-thrust belt, characterized by different combinations of simple and pure shear (Calamita et al., 2012; Pace et al., 2015): the OAS frontal thrust ramp, the OAS oblique ramp and an inner sector characterized by a back-thrust in a transpressive context.

The documented magnetic fabric shows similar evolution in all the deformation regimes, depending upon the increasing of deformation (lower vorticity number) and proximity to the main thrust (Fig. 9). Six different fabrics were identified:

A. sedimentary fabric characterized by magnetic foliation-bedding parallelism (Hrouda and Chadima, 2019 and references therein);

B. an early stage of deformation with k_1 at the intersection between bedding and S plane (so called intersection lineation; Hrouda and Chadima, 2019);

C. magnetic foliation parallel to S and k_1 parallel to the S/C intersection, progressively evolving with the deformation increments (Parés et al., 1999; Pueyo Anchuela et al., 2010) in stage D;

D. magnetic foliation parallel to S and k_1 (or k_3 in case of possible inverse fabrics documented in Boragine) intermediate between S/C intersection and the slip vector. In case of pure-shear-dominated regime, k_1 is intermediate between S/T intersection and the transport direction;

E. the magnetic foliation shows a double tendency to parallelize either the S or the C planes, and k_1 is parallel to the slip vector or the transport direction (in case of pure shear component);

F. documented in pure-shear-dominated deformation regime only, shows the parallelism between k_1 (or k_3 in case of possible inverse fabrics) axis and extensional planes intersection.

These results show that the magnetic fabric is more sensitive to the simple shear deformation, as the magnetic lineation tends to parallelize mostly with the computed slip vector. In pure-shear dominated regimes, the magnetic lineation becomes parallel to the transport direction when the deformation is really intense (sites at less than 15-30 cm from the thrust plane).

These results suggest that it is fundamental to use a combination of density diagrams and cluster analysis on AMS data in order to discriminate subfabrics linked to different events. In this way, AMS potential as a tool to unravel different sedimentary or tectonic features is enhanced.

Acknowledgments

CRT, ET, EZ and SS were funded by MIUR ex-60% attributed to SS and EZ. DS Erasmus traineeship at CIMaN - ALP was funded by University of Silesia in Katowice.

581 **Supplementary material**

582 **Supplementary Table 1:** Anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility data at specimen level of all
583 the studied sites, subdivided by locality. Columns: Site; Specimen name; k_m = mean bulk
584 magnetic susceptibility (μSI); weight (g); χ_m = mean mass magnetic susceptibility ($10^{-9} \text{ m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}$);
585 L = magnetic lineation; F = magnetic foliation; P' = corrected anisotropy degree; T = shape
586 parameter; ; D = declination ($^\circ$), I = inclination ($^\circ$) of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes
587 k_1 , k_2 and k_3 , respectively.

588 **Supplementary Table 2:** Anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility data at site level for all the
589 studied localities. Columns: Locality; Site; Stage = degree of deformation from sedimentary
590 fabric (A) to latest tectonic event (F), (*) inverse fabric and (//) tectonic fabric parallel to the
591 transport direction; n/N = number of specimens accepted/number of specimens measured; k_m
592 = mean bulk magnetic susceptibility (μSI) and its standard deviation; χ_m = mean mass magnetic
593 susceptibility ($10^{-9} \text{ m}^3\text{kg}^{-1}$) and its standard deviation; L = magnetic lineation; F = magnetic
594 foliation; P' = corrected anisotropy degree; T = shape parameter; D = declination ($^\circ$), I =
595 inclination ($^\circ$) and 95% confidence angle ($^\circ$) of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes k_1 , k_2
596 and k_3 , respectively.

597

598 **References**

- 599 Alberti, M., Decandia, F.A., Tavarnerelli, E., 1996. Modes of propagation of the compressional
600 deformation in the Umbria-Marche Apennines. *Memorie della Società Geologica Italiana*
601 51, 71–82.
- 602 Alfonsi, L., 1995. Wrench tectonic in Central Italy, a segment of the Sabina Fault. *Bollettino*
603 della Società Geologica Italiana 114, 411–421.
- 604 Almqvist, B.S.G., Koyi, H., 2018. Bulk strain in orogenic wedges based on insights from
605 magnetic fabrics in sandbox models. *Geology* 46, 483–486.
606 <https://doi.org/10.1130/G39998.1>
- 607 Aranguren, A., Cuevas, J., Tubía, J.M., 1996. Composite magnetic fabrics from S-C mylonites.
608 *Journal of Structural Geology* 18, 863–869. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(96\)00013-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(96)00013-2)
609 [2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(96)00013-2)
- 610 Arthur, M.A., Fischer, A.G., 1977. Upper Cretaceous–Paleocene magnetic stratigraphy at
611 Gubbio, Italy I. Lithostratigraphy and sedimentology. *GSA Bulletin* 88, 367–371.
612 [https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606\(1977\)88<367:UCMSAG>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1130/0016-7606(1977)88<367:UCMSAG>2.0.CO;2)
- 613 Aubourg, C., Smith, B., Eshraghi, A., Lacombe, O., Authemayou, C., Amrouch, K., Bellier,
614 O., Mouthereau, F., 2010. New magnetic fabric data and their comparison with
615 palaeostress markers in the Western Fars Arc (Zagros, Iran): tectonic implications.
616 *Geological Society, London, Special Publications* 330, 97–120.
617 <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP330.6>
- 618 Berthé, D., Choukroune, P., Jegouzo, P., 1979. Orthogneiss, mylonite and non coaxial
619 deformation of granites: the example of the South Armorican Shear Zone. *Journal of*
620 *Structural Geology* 1, 31–42. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(79\)90019-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(79)90019-1)

621 Boccaletti, M., Calamita, F., Viandante, M.G., 2005. La Neo-Catena litosferica appenninica
 622 nata a partire dal Pliocene inferiore come espressione della convergenza Africa-Europa.
 623 Bollettino della Società Geologica Italiana 124, 87–105.

624 Borradaile, G.J., Alford, C., 1988. Experimental shear zones and magnetic fabrics. *Journal of*
 625 *Structural Geology* 10, 895–904. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(88\)90102-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(88)90102-2)

626 Borradaile, G.J., Hamilton, T., 2004. Magnetic fabrics may proxy as neotectonic stress
 627 trajectories, Polis rift, Cyprus. *Tectonics* 23. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002TC001434>

628 Borradaile, G.J., Henry, B., 1997. Tectonic applications of magnetic susceptibility and its
 629 anisotropy. *Earth-Science Reviews* 42, 49–93. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252(96)00044-X)
 630 [8252\(96\)00044-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-8252(96)00044-X)

631 Borradaile, G.J., Jackson, M., 2004. Anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility (AMS): magnetic
 632 petrofabrics of deformed rocks. Geological Society, London, Special Publications 238,
 633 299–360. <https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.SP.2004.238.01.18>

634 Borradaile, G.J., Jackson, M., 2010. Structural geology, petrofabrics and magnetic fabrics
 635 (AMS, AARM, AIRM). *Journal of Structural Geology* 32, 1519–1551.
 636 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2009.09.006>

637 Butler, R.W.H., Tavarnerelli, E., Grasso, M., 2006. Structural inheritance in mountain belts: An
 638 Alpine–Apennine perspective. *Journal of Structural Geology*, Tectonic inversion and
 639 structural inheritance in mountain belts 28, 1893–1908.
 640 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2006.09.006>

641 Calamita, F., 1991. Extensional mesostructures in thrust shear zones examples from the
 642 Umbro-Marchean Apennines. Bollettino della Società Geologica Italiana 110, 649–660.

643 Calamita, F., Coltorti, M., Piccinini, D., Pierantoni, P.P., Pizzi, A., Ripepe, M., Scisciani, V.,
 644 Turco, E., 2000. Quaternary faults and seismicity in the Umbro-Marchean Apennines

645 (Central Italy): evidence from the 1997 Colfiorito earthquake. *Journal of Geodynamics* 29,
646 245–264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-3707\(99\)00054-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-3707(99)00054-X)

647 Calamita, F., Decandia, F.A., Deiana, G., Fiori, A.P., 1991. Deformation of SC tectonites in
648 the Scaglia Cinera Formation in the Spoleto area (Southeast Umbria). *Bollettino della*
649 *Società Geologica Italiana* 110, 661–665.

650 Calamita, F., Deiana, G., Invernizzi, C., Mastrovincenzo, S., 1987. Analisi strutturale della
651 «Linea Amona-Anzio» Auct. tra Cittareale e Micigliano (Rieti). *Bollettino della Società*
652 *Geologica Italiana* 106, 365–375.

653 Calamita, F., Satolli, S., Scisciani, V., Eserice, P., Pace, P., 2011. Contrasting styles of fault
654 reactivation in curved orogenic belts: Examples from the Central Apennines (Italy). *GSA*
655 *Bulletin* 123, 1097–1111. <https://doi.org/10.1130/B30276.1>

656 Calamita, F., Satolli, S., Turtù, A., 2012. Analysis of thrust shear zones in curve-shaped belts:
657 Deformation mode and timing of the Olevano-Antrodoco-Sibillini thrust
658 (Central/Northern Apennines of Italy). *Journal of Structural Geology* 44, 179–187.
659 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2012.07.007>

660 Caricchi, C., Cifelli, F., Kissel, C., Sagnotti, L., Mattei, M., 2016. Distinct magnetic fabric in
661 weakly deformed sediments from extensional basins and fold-and-thrust structures in the
662 Northern Apennine orogenic belt (Italy). *Tectonics* 35, 238–256.
663 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015TC003940>

664 Casas-Sainz, A.M., Gil-Imaz, A., Simón, J.L., Izquierdo-Llavall, E., Aldega, L., Román-
665 Berdiel, T., Osácar, M.C., Pueyo-Anchuela, Ó., Ansón, M., García-Lasanta, C., Corrado,
666 S., Invernizzi, C., Caricchi, C., 2018. Strain indicators and magnetic fabric in intraplate
667 fault zones: Case study of Daroca thrust, Iberian Chain, Spain. *Tectonophysics* 730, 29–
668 47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2018.02.013>

669 Casas-Sainz, A.M., Román-Berdiel, T., Oliva-Urcia, B., García-Lasanta, C., Villalaín, J.J.,
 670 Aldega, L., Corrado, S., Caricchi, C., Invernizzi, C., Osácar, M.C., 2017. Multidisciplinary
 671 approach to constrain kinematics of fault zones at shallow depths: a case study from the
 672 Cameros–Demanda thrust (North Spain). *Int J Earth Sci (Geol Rundsch)* 106, 1023–1055.
 673 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00531-016-1349-5>
 674 Castellarin, A., Colacicchi, R., Praturlon, A., Cantelli, C., 1982. The Jurassic-Lower Pliocene
 675 history of the Ancona-Anzio Line (Central Italy). *Mem. Soc. Geol. Ital* 24, 325–336.
 676 Centamore, E., Micarelli, A., 1991. L’ambiente fisico delle Marche. *Geologia, Geomorfologia,*
 677 *Idrogeologia* (scala 1: 100. 000).
 678 Chadima, M., Jelínek, V., 2008. Anisoft 4.2.—Anisotropy data browser. *Contributions to*
 679 *Geophysics and Geodesy* 38, 38–41.
 680 Ciarapica, G., Passeri, L., 2002. The palaeogeographic duplicity of the Apennines. *Boll. Soc.*
 681 *Geol. It.* 1, 67–75.
 682 Di Domenica, A., Turtù, A., Satolli, S., Calamita, F., 2012. Relationships between thrusts and
 683 normal faults in curved belts: New insight in the inversion tectonics of the Central-
 684 Northern Apennines (Italy). *Journal of Structural Geology* 42, 104–117.
 685 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2012.06.008>
 686 Ferré, E.C., Gébelin, A., Till, J.L., Sassier, C., Burmeister, K.C., 2014. Deformation and
 687 magnetic fabrics in ductile shear zones: A review. *Tectonophysics* 629, 179–188.
 688 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2014.04.008>
 689 Fossen, H., 2010. *Structural Geology*. Cambridge University Press.
 690 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511777806>
 691 Fossen, H., Cavalcante, G.C.G., 2017. Shear zones – A review. *Earth-Science Reviews* 171,
 692 434–455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2017.05.002>

693 Ghisetti, F., 1987. Mechanisms of thrust faulting in the Gran Sasso chain, Central Apennines,
694 Italy. *Journal of Structural Geology* 9, 955–967. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(87)90004-6)
695 [8141\(87\)90004-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(87)90004-6)

696 Graham, J.W., 1966. Significance of Magnetic Anisotropy in Appalachian Sedimentary Rocks,
697 in: Steinhart, J.S., Smith, T.J. (Eds.), *Geophysical Monograph Series*. American
698 Geophysical Union, Washington, D. C., pp. 627–648.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1029/GM010p0627>

700 Harris, L.B., Cobbold, P.R., 1985. Development of conjugate shear bands during bulk simple
701 shearing. *Journal of Structural Geology* 7, 37–44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(85)90113-0)
702 [8141\(85\)90113-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(85)90113-0)

703 Holdsworth, R.E., Strachan, R.A., Alsop, G.I., Grant, C.J., Wilson, R.W., 2006. Thrust
704 sequences and the significance of low-angle, out-of-sequence faults in the northernmost
705 Moine Nappe and Moine Thrust Zone, NW Scotland. *Journal of the Geological Society*
706 163, 801–814. <https://doi.org/10.1144/0016-76492005-076>

707 Housen, B.A., Van Der Pluijm, B.A., Essene, E.J., 1995. Plastic behavior of magnetite and
708 high strains obtained from magnetic fabrics in the Parry Sound shear zone, Ontario
709 Grenville Province. *Journal of Structural Geology* 17, 265–278.
710 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(94\)E0045-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(94)E0045-Z)

711 Hrouda, F., 2002. Low-field variation of magnetic susceptibility and its effect on the anisotropy
712 of magnetic susceptibility of rocks. *Geophysical Journal International* 150, 715–723.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-246X.2002.01731.x>

714 Hrouda, F., Chadima, M., 2019. Examples of tectonic overprints of magnetic fabrics in rocks
715 of the Bohemian Massif and Western Carpathians. *Int J Earth Sci (Geol Rundsch)*.
716 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00531-019-01786-8>

717 Hrouda, F., Ježek, J., 1999. Magnetic anisotropy indications of deformations associated with
718 diagenesis. Geological Society, London, Special Publications 151, 127–137.
719 <https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.SP.1999.151.01.13>

720 ISPRA, 2007, Carta Geologica d'Italia 1:50.000 - Catalogo delle Formazioni, *Periodici tecnici*
721 *Volume 7*

722 Jégouzo, P., 1980. The South Armorican Shear Zone. Journal of Structural Geology, Shear
723 zones in rocks 2, 39–47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(80\)90032-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(80)90032-2)

724 Jelínek, V., 1977. The statistical theory of measuring anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility of
725 rocks and its application. Geofyzika Brno, Czech Republic.

726 Jelínek, V., 1981. Characterization of the magnetic fabric of rocks. Tectonophysics 79, T63–
727 T67. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-1951\(81\)90110-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-1951(81)90110-4)

728 Koopman, A., 1983. Detachment tectonics in the Central Apennines, Italy. Geologica
729 Ultraiectina 30, 1–55.

730 Lavecchia, G., 1985. Il sovrascorrimento dei Monti Sibillini: analisi cinematica e strutturale.
731 Bollettino della Società Geologica Italiana 104, 161–194.

732 Lister, G.S., Snoke, A.W., 1984. S-C Mylonites. Journal of Structural Geology 6, 617–638.
733 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(84\)90001-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(84)90001-4)

734 Mattei, M., Funiciello, R., Kissel, C., 1995. Paleomagnetic and structural evidence for Neogene
735 block rotations in the Central Apennines, Italy. J. Geophys. Res. 100, 17863–17883.
736 <https://doi.org/10.1029/95JB00864>

737 Pace, P., Calamita, F., 2014. Push-up inversion structures v. fault-bend reactivation anticlines
738 along oblique thrust ramps: examples from the Apennines fold-and-thrust belt (Italy).
739 Journal of the Geological Society 171, 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1144/jgs2013-053>

740 Pace, P., Calamita, F., Tavarnerelli, E., 2015. Brittle-ductile shear zones along inversion-related
741 frontal and oblique thrust ramps: Insights from the Central-Northern Apennines curved

742 thrust system (Italy), in: Mukherjee, S., Mulchrone, K.F. (Eds.), Ductile Shear Zones. John
 743 Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK, pp. 111–127.
 744 <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118844953.ch8>

745 Parés, J.M., 2015. Sixty years of anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility in deformed sedimentary
 746 rocks. *Front. Earth Sci.* 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2015.00004>

747 Parés, J.M., van der Pluijm, B.A., 2002. Evaluating magnetic lineations (AMS) in deformed
 748 rocks. *Tectonophysics* 350, 283–298. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1951\(02\)00119-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1951(02)00119-1)

749 Parés, J.M., van der Pluijm, B.A., Dinarès-Turell, J., 1999. Evolution of magnetic fabrics
 750 during incipient deformation of mudrocks (Pyrenees, northern Spain). *Tectonophysics*
 751 307, 1–14. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1951\(99\)00115-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1951(99)00115-8)

752 Passchier, C.W., 2001. Flanking structures. *Journal of Structural Geology* 23, 951–962.
 753 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(00\)00166-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(00)00166-8)

754 Pierantoni, P.P., 1996. Faglie trascorrenti sin-thrusting come ripartizione della deformazione:
 755 L'esempio della Faglia Sabina (Appennino Centrale). *Studi Geologici Camerti* 14, 279–
 756 289.

757 Platt, J.P., 1984. Secondary cleavages in ductile shear zones. *Journal of Structural Geology* 6,
 758 439–442. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(84\)90045-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(84)90045-2)

759 Platt, J.P., Vissers, R.L.M., 1980. Extensional structures in anisotropic rocks. *Journal of*
 760 *Structural Geology* 2, 397–410. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(80\)90002-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(80)90002-4)

761 Ponce de Leon, M.I., Choukroune, P., 1980. Shear zones in the iberian arc. *Journal of Structural*
 762 *Geology*, *Shear zones in rocks* 2, 63–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(80\)90035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(80)90035-8)

763 Pueyo Anchuela, Ó., Pocoví Juan, A., Gil Imaz, A., 2010. Tectonic imprint in magnetic fabrics
 764 in foreland basins: A case study from the Ebro Basin, N Spain. *Tectonophysics* 492, 150–
 765 163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tecto.2010.06.016>

766 Ramsay, J.G., 1980. Shear zone geometry: A review. *Journal of Structural Geology* 2, 83–99.
 767 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141\(80\)90038-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8141(80)90038-3)
 768 Ramsay, J.G., Graham, R.H., 1970. Strain variation in shear belts. *Can. J. Earth Sci.* 7, 786–
 769 813. <https://doi.org/10.1139/e70-078>
 770 Ramsay, J.G., Huber, M.I., 1987. The Techniques of Modern Structural Geology, in: *Folds and*
 771 *Fractures*, Vol. II. Academic Press, London.
 772 Riedel, W., 1929. Zur Mechanik geologischer Brucherscheinungen. Ein Beitrag zum Problem
 773 der Fiederspatten. *Zentbl. Miner. Geol. Palaont. Abt.* 354–368.
 774 Robustelli Test, C., Festa, A., Zanella, E., Codegone, G., Scaramuzzo, E., 2019. Distinguishing
 775 the Mélange-Forming Processes in Subduction-Accretion Complexes: Constraints from
 776 the Anisotropy of Magnetic Susceptibility (AMS). *Geosciences* 9, 381.
 777 <https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences9090381>
 778 Röllner, K., Trepmann, C.A., 2008. Stereo32 v1.0.1 Software and helpfile. Ruhr-Universität
 779 Bochum, Institut für Geologie, Mineralogie & Geophysik.
 780 Scisciani, V., 2009. Styles of positive inversion tectonics in the Central Apennines and in the
 781 Adriatic foreland: Implications for the evolution of the Apennine chain (Italy). *Journal of*
 782 *Structural Geology* 31, 1276–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2009.02.004>
 783 Sidman, D., Ferré, E.C., Teyssier, C., Jackson, M., 2005. Magnetic fabric and microstructure
 784 of a mylonite: example from the Bitterroot shear zone, western Montana. *Geological*
 785 *Society, London, Special Publications* 245, 143–163.
 786 <https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.SP.2005.245.01.07>
 787 Tarling, D., Hrouda, F., 1993. *Magnetic Anisotropy of Rocks*. Chapman & Hall, London.
 788 Tavarnelli, E., 1997. Structural evolution of a foreland fold-and-thrust belt: the Umbria-Marche
 789 Apennines, Italy. *Journal of Structural Geology, Fault-Related Folding* 19, 523–534.
 790 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(96\)00093-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(96)00093-4)

791 Tavarnelli, E., 1999. Normal faults in thrust sheets: pre-orogenic extension, post-orogenic
 792 extension, or both? *Journal of Structural Geology* 21, 1011–1018.
 793 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141\(99\)00034-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8141(99)00034-6)

794 Tavarnelli, E., Butler, R.W.H., Decandia, F.A., Calamita, F., Grasso, M., Alvarez, W., Renda,
 795 P., 2004. Implications of fault reactivation and structural inheritance in the Cenozoic
 796 tectonic evolution of Italy, in: Crescenti, U., D’offizi, S., Merlino, S., Sacchi, S. (Eds.) *The*
 797 *Geology of Italy*, Società Geologica Italiana, Special Volume, 209–222.

798 Turtù, A., Satolli, S., Maniscalco, R., Calamita, F., Speranza, F., 2013. Understanding
 799 progressive-arc- and strike-slip-related rotations in curve-shaped orogenic belts: The case
 800 of the Olevano-Antrodoco-Sibillini thrust (Northern Apennines, Italy). *J. Geophys. Res.*
 801 *Solid Earth* 118, 459–473. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrb.50096>

802 Weil, A.B., Yonkee, A., 2009. Anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility in weakly deformed red
 803 beds from the Wyoming salient, Sevier thrust belt: Relations to layer-parallel shortening
 804 and orogenic curvature. *Lithosphere* 1, 235–256. <https://doi.org/10.1130/L42.1>

805 Xypolias, P., 2010. Vorticity analysis in shear zones: A review of methods and applications.
 806 *Journal of Structural Geology* 32, 2072–2092. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsg.2010.08.009>

Table 1
Click here to download Table: Table 1.xlsx

Table 1: Summary of the anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility data at site level.

Locality	Site	Stage	n/N	$\chi_m (\pm \sigma)$ ($\times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1}$)	P'	T	k ₁			k ₃		
							D	I	95% conf. angles	D	I	95% conf. angles
Sassotetto	SSR1		16/20	11.16 ± 5.19	1.040	0.785	295	32	52.1 18.3	47	31	21.1 11.6
	SSR1-SF1	E	10/16	12.71 ± 5.76	1.030	0.671	191	50	56.7 22.9	40	36	26.8 12.9
	SSR1-SF2	C	6/16	8.56 ± 2.86	1.061	0.386	304	29	18.6 8.8	51	28	13.3 8.6
Monastero	MSC1		19/20	39.65 ± 21.54	1.021	0.613	342	5	35.1 13.5	76	39	18.6 12.1
	MSC1-SF1	C	8/19	17.20 ± 4.45	1.021	0.903	161	2.3	77.5 12.0	70	32	14.4 8.9
	MSC1-SF2	C	11/19	55.98 ± 11.19	1.023	0.465	346	6	19.2 13.2	82	45	20.2 10.7
	MSC2		19/19	24.69 ± 2.66	1.017	0.648	133	13	59.4 13.0	1	71	22.2 13.8
	MSC2-SF1	A	10/19	24.12 ± 1.91	1.019	0.158	100	1	31.8 12.9	8	77	17.0 11.4
	MSC2-SF2	B	9/19	25.32 ± 3.39	1.020	0.052	169	22	28.5 14.2	351	68	32.5 14.2
Infernaccio	ISC1		19/21	22.07 ± 7.02	1.032	0.856	212	50	75.1 24.4	76	32	30.1 24.6
	ISC1-SF1	D	14/19	18.63 ± 2.86	1.014	0.479	183	35	53.3 21.6	68	31	33.8 14.9
	ISC1-SF2	E	5/19	31.71 ± 6.10	1.117	0.657	297	59	17.9 7.7	79	25	18.7 7.6
Monte Boragine	BSR2	F*	10/15	-2.03 ± 0.98	1.076	-0.351	319	59	68.7 18.1	180	25	31.9 16.0
	BSR1	F*	10/19	-3.33 ± 1.81	1.027	-0.656	169	80	70.0 31.0	9	10	43.3 23.9
	BMC1	E ^{//}	8/12	2.52 ± 1.94	1.055	0.147	250	46	59.9 27.9	4	21	52.9 20.8
	BMC2		13/16	9.83 ± 6.33	1.032	0.593	243	13	43.6 17.3	128	61	25.7 17.3
	BMC2-SF1	E or E ^{//}	6/13	6.44 ± 2.28	1.027	0.175	35	6	37.0 23.4	134	57	31.3 14.7
	BMC2-SF2	D ^{//}	7/13	12.74 ± 7.37	1.040	0.410	266	23	30.8 18.2	121	63	22.4 14.2
	BMC3		15/21	1.05 ± 2.96	1.121	-0.037	201	21	44.2 24.5	9	69	59.4 23.6
	BMC3-SF1	E or E ^{//}	8/15	3.34 ± 1.96	1.035	-0.225	211	1	49.7 20.5	304	72	45.3 28.5
	BMC3-SF2	D*	7/15	-1.56 ± 1.00	1.080	0.071	197	29	34.2 19.9	29	61	54.6 15.2
Valle Scura	VSR2		19/21	7.23 ± 1.88	1.022	0.010	207	25	32.2 17.8	31	65	35.3 16.6
	VSR2-SF1	E ^{//}	14/19	7.12 ± 1.80	1.027	-0.383	211	25	23.3 16.7	28	65	43.5 15.2
	VSR2-SF2	F	5/19	7.52 ± 2.29	1.020	-0.134	132	4	23.0 12.1	35	59	22.7 15.6
	VSR1	E ^{//}	23/24	9.29 ± 2.17	1.039	0.091	230	28	24.3 18.0	67	61	24.3 18.0
	VMC1		18/21	8.56 ± 3.56	1.015	0.529	263	21	68.5 14.8	29	57	33.5 18.7
	VMC1-SF1	E ^{//}	10/18	8.16 ± 2.22	1.020	-0.346	227	26	22.5 18.6	1	55	45.1 21.6
	VMC1-SF2	F	8/18	9.07 ± 4.89	1.023	-0.361	303	5	28.3 9.6	38	42	46.0 10.3
	VCM2		19/21	12.25 ± 2.37	1.024	0.406	234	21	49.0 15.8	37	68	22.7 15.8
	VMC2-SF1	D ^{//}	9/19	12.25 ± 2.37	1.032	-0.004	253	19	11.6 10.5	43	68	28.2 8.7
	VMC2-SF2	E	10/19	12.42 ± 1.51	1.020	0.186	191	20	25.6 14.1	28	69	26.8 14.9
	VCM3		18/21	11.56 ± 3.62	1.022	0.442	204	22	44.0 20.6	60	64	28.3 20.1
	VMC3-SF1	D ^{//}	8/18	11.44 ± 3.24	1.025	0.120	244	38	30.4 17.3	64	53	23.6 21.8
Cottanello	CSR1		13/15	2.97 ± 1.21	1.025	-0.056	317	35	50.4 26.9	204	29	39.4 26.3
	CSR1-SF1	D	6/13	2.4 ± 1.37	1.039	0.113	325	42	53.5 22.8	188	39	36.8 21.3
	CSR1-SF2	C	7/13	3.47 ± 0.86	1.019	0.097	312	17	51.2 11.4	221	5	30.5 11.4
	CSR2		16/22	5.72 ± 2.79	1.026	0.058	329	22	47.5 25.1	167	67	47.6 23.0
	CSR2-SF1	E	8/16	5.91 ± 2.78	1.045	0.222	13	40	22.2 13.5	188	50	14.6 13.0
	CSR2-SF2	C	8/16	5.52 ± 2.97	1.038	0.329	324	4	32.8 12.9	60	57	27.4 13.6
	CSR3		15/20	6.76 ± 4.20	1.042	0.453	12	18	56.0 26.6	228	68	26.8 10.8
	CSR3-SF1	E	9/15	5.80 ± 4.30	1.049	-0.026	20	16	36.0 26.5	240	69	26.8 14.6
	CSR3-SF2	C	6/15	8.19 ± 3.97	1.042	0.395	308	1	37.4 8.0	217	61	20.9 4.8

Columns: Locality; Site; Stage = degree of deformation from sedimentary fabric (A) to latest tectonic event (F), (*)inverse fabric and (//)tectonic fabric χ parallel to the transport direction; n/N = number of specimens accepted/number of specimens measured; m = mean mass magnetic susceptibility (10-9m3kg-1) and






Figure 1: Schematic geological map of the Northern Apennines (Italy) with the studied localities (white stars), modified after Calamita et al. (2012). The curve-shaped Olevano-Antrodoco-Sibillini (OAS) thrust is the outer front of the Northern Apennines.

FRONTAL THRUST RAMP


SASSOTETTO



MONASTERO




INFERNACCIO




OBLIQUE THRUST RAMP

BORAGINE




VALLESCURA



BACK THRUST

COTTANELLO



- ■ — mean shear plane C and pole
- ♦ — mean pressure solution cleavage S and pole
- ○ — mean synthetic Riedel plane R and pole
- ● — mean antithetic Riedel planes R' and pole
- ★ — mean bedding and pole
- ■ — mean thrust plane T and pole
- ● — mean antithetic extesional plane E' and pole
- ○ — mean synthetic extensional plane E and pole

- ▲ S/C or S/T intersection
- ▲ E/E' intersection
- ↗ slickenside
- transport direction
- ↗ computed slip vector

Figure 2: Summary of the structural data for each studied locality integrated with data from the literature (Calamita et al., 2012; Turtù et al., 2013; Pace et al., 2015).


Figure 3

Figure 3: Box-and-whisker plots of the a) mass magnetic susceptibility (χ_m), b) corrected anisotropy degree (P') and c) shape parameter (T) for the studied localities. Central boxes include values between the lower and upper quartiles. Different gray shades correspond to different lithologies.

Figure 4




Figure 4: Corrected anisotropy degree (P') vs. mass susceptibility (m) and shape parameter (T) vs. corrected anisotropy degree (P') plots for the various localities. Different symbols correspond to different lithologies: circles and stars for Scaglia Rossa Fm., squares for Scaglia Cinerea Fm. and lozenges and triangles for Marone con Cerrognia Fm.




Figure 5: Magnetic fabric from the frontal thrust ramp at Sassotetto, Monastero (sites MSC1 and MSC2) and Invernaccio. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics (middle and right).




Figure 6: Magnetic fabric from the oblique thrust ramp at Boragine. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics when detected (middle and right). Legend as in Figure 5.




Figure 7: Magnetic fabric from the oblique thrust ramp at Vallescura. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics when detected (middle and right). Legend as in Figure 5.

Figure 8




Figure 8: Magnetic fabric from the back-thrust at Cottanello. Equal area projections in geographic coordinates of the principal magnetic susceptibility axes at site level (left) and relative subfabrics (middle and right). Legend as in Figure 5.




Figure 9: Summary of magnetic fabric stages and comparison with structural data. Representative examples from the different deformation regimes are reported. Conceptual diagram of the different types of shear deformation fabric (ZX section of strain ellipses) related to frontal (FTR) and oblique (OTR) thrust ramps (modified from Calamita et al., 2012; Pace et al., 2015).

Declaration of interests

☒ The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐ The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Author contributions

SS: Project administration, funding acquisition, conceptualization, field work, methodology, laboratory analysis, structural analysis, writing - original draft.

CRT: field work, laboratory analysis, data curation, structural analysis, methodology, formal analysis, writing - original draft, data visualization

DS: field work, laboratory analysis, writing - review and editing

EZ: supervision, funding acquisition, field work, writing - original draft, data visualization

FC: field work, structural analysis, writing - review and editing

ET: field work, laboratory analysis, writing - review and editing